

### REMARKS

Applicants are submitting herewith this Amendment in response to the Office Action dated July 1, 2005. Claim 31 has been amended; and claim 35 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. In the Office Action, claims 31, 32, 33, 34, and 36 are rejected for alleged double patenting under section 101 in view of claims 1-4, 7, and 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,888,998; and claim 35 is rejected for alleged obviousness-type double patenting in view of claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,888,998. Applicants believe that the rejections have been overcome as discussed below in greater detail.

With respect to the section 101 rejection, claim 31 has been amended as previously provided. As amended, claim 31 further includes the elements from claim 35. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn in view of same where the remaining rejected claims (e.g., claims 32-34 and 36) depend from claim 31.

With respect to the obviousness-type double patenting rejection, claim 35 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and thus, this rejection with respect to same has been rendered moot and should be withdrawn. Of the remaining pending claims, claim 31 is the sole independent claim that has been amended to include the elements from claim 35 as previously provided. Further, Applicants are submitting herewith a Terminal Disclaimer to address the alleged obviousness-type double patenting rejection with respect to same. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit reconsideration of same.

Respectfully submitted,

BY 

Thomas C. Basso (46,541)  
Cust. No. 29175

Dated: November 30, 2005